

**REMARKS**

In order to assist the Examiner in filling out PTOL-413 in accordance with USPTO MPEP rule 713.04, Applicant hereby provides a summary of the telephonic interview between Examiner Thompson, Mr. Clarkson and Ms. Haitjema from 11AM – 11:35AM EST.

Applicant did not provide the Examiner with proposed claim amendments, exhibits, or argumentation prior to the interview.

During the interview, the status of the case was discussed. This application has been finally rejected and a response by Applicant has not yet been submitted.

Differences between the instant application and the Marais reference (WO 2000/68908) were discussed. Specifically, the location of an isolation transformer in the claimed invention (and the absence of one in Marais), as well as the one-on-one relationship between the workplace and the workplace module of the claimed invention were discussed.

In the pending office action, the Examiner had suggested that the isolation transformer (as taught in Tsai) could be placed with the UPS 70 of Marais in Figure 2. However, Applicant pointed out that even if the isolation transformer were present in Marais, positioning of the transformer at the location of the UPS 70 would still not lead to an isolation transformer for each workplace module as required by claim 1. Applicant emphasized the importance of the recognition of providing each workplace module with individual isolation transformers at each workplace according to the claimed invention to ensure safe operation of the unit elements such the video registration device and the audio interface and efficient setup of the system.

Thereafter Applicant discussed what a workplace module 22 is in the context of the claimed invention. Specifically, Applicant discussed the one-on-one relationship between the workplace module 5 and the workplace unit 4 for a workplace 24. This increases efficiency and has proven itself as an attractive solution to industry and licensees. This is in contrast to the system in Marais, where a central surveillance station controls multiple cameras, audiovisual alarm plug points, video plug points and the like for multiple workplaces.

This was also explained in the context of a single signal transmitter for multiple workplace modules, according to the claimed invention, as also discussed on page 9 of the application as filed. Applicant offered and the Examiner agreed to a graphical representation to show this feature. Applicants provide herewith a proposed Figure 11.

OCT 25 2010

By contrast to the claimed invention, each central surveillance station 20 of Marais is directly connected to the control room 32.

Further, Applicant explained the advantages of the claimed invention over other systems, like the Marais system. Applicant explained the increased mobility and the significant reduction in set-up time of Applicant's claimed invention with a one-on-one workplace module to workplace as opposed to a system like Marais, where elements such as cameras and gas sensors from multiple points are directly connected to the remote central surveillance system.

No specific claim amendments were discussed. The Examiner would take Applicant's comments into consideration and check with the SPE to confirm the best route forward to allowable subject matter. Applicant offered to provide this summary and to call the Examiner on Thursday, October 28, 2010 around 11AM to receive information/guidance in the best method forward.

Should the Examiner need further information or have specific questions in the interim period, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned either via email [haitjemac@howrey.com](mailto:haitjemac@howrey.com), return fax at 011 31 20 463 72 96, or telephone 9-011-31-20-592-4577.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### Extension of Time

Any extension of time that may be deemed necessary to further the prosecution of this application is hereby requested.

#### Authorization to Charge Fees

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-3038, referencing the docket number shown above.

#### Authorization to Communicate via email

Pursuant to MPEP 502.03, authorization is hereby given to the USPTO to communicate with Applicant's representative concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail. I understand that a copy of these communications will be made

of record in the application file. Applicant's representative, Coraline J. Haitjema, can be reached at email address [haitjemac@horwrey.com](mailto:haitjemac@horwrey.com).

Respectfully submitted,

/cjhaitjema/

Coraline J. Haitjema  
Reg. No. 63,192

Date: October 25, 2010

Customer No. 32,894  
Howrey LLP  
2941 Fairview Park Drive, Suite 200  
Falls Church, VA 22042  
Fax: 202-383-7195  
Tel: 9-011-31-20-592-4411